UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,868	04/28/2005	Francois Andre	03715.0147	3789
²²⁸⁵² 7590 06/19/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			NOAKES, SUZANNE MARIE	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			06/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/532,868	ANDRE ET AL.		
omee Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
The MAN INC DATE And	Suzanne M. Noakes, Ph.D.	1656		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 A_I 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-67 are subject to restriction and/or example.	vn from consideration. election requirement.			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the formula of the following (s) be held in abeyance. See for is required if the drawing (s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)		·		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		

Application/Control Number: 10/532,868

Art Unit: 1656

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-16 and 26, drawn to a method for designing a 3-D model of a protein by using pre-determined three-dimensional structures from at least three members of family to identify common structural blocks of said family and produce a new 3-D model of a different protein from the same family.

Group II, claim(s) 17-25, drawn to a 3-D model produced by the method of Group I.

Group III, claim(s) 27-39, drawn to a computer assisted method for performing restrained dynamics docking of a substrate on an enzyme using an available 3-D structure.

Group IV, claim(s) 40-59, drawn to drawn to a computer assisted method for performing restrained dynamics docking of at least two substrates on an enzyme using an available 3-D structure.

Group V, claim 60-67, drawn to use of a method for performing restrained dynamics docking to screen, design and identify molecules that modulate an enzyme.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Jean et al. (Proteins:Structure, Function and Genetics, 1997, 28:388-404 – cited on IDS from 13 July 2005) teach methods using a computational strategy for homology modeling proteins or enzymes in various families by identifying common or core structural blocks

Application/Control Number: 10/532,868

Art Unit: 1656

from three different cytochrome P450 known 3-D models. The method also uses a consensus matrix to improve the sequence alignment between the target cytochrome P450 to be modeled and the existing structures (see p. 388, Abstract). In this way a new model was produced for P450_{eryF} (see p. 403, 1st column, 1st paragraph). Thus, the new model of the P450_{eryF}, since it is not materially different than the model being claimed in claim 17, then Jean et al. meet the limitations of the claim because it is the product that is being claimed and not the process. It is deemed that the process of claim 1 does not make a materially different product to the 3-D model of Jean et al.

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I-V does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not differentiate the claimed subject matter as a whole over the prior art. Since according to PCT Rule 13.2 the presence of such a common or corresponding special technical feature is an absolute prerequisite for unity to be established, and given that there does not appear to be any other technical feature common to the claimed subject matter as a whole which might be able to fulfill this role, the currently claimed subject matter lacks unity of invention according to PCT Rule 13.1.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

Page 4

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne M. Noakes, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-2924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7.00am to 3.30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kathleen Kerr Bragdon can be reached on 571-272-0931. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/532,868

Art Unit: 1656

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 5

SMN

14 June 2007